

REPORT ON UNMANNED COPY CENTER
OPERATED BY THE RECORDS ADMINISTRATION BRANCH

STAT 1. After a lengthy search for space and much negotiating, an unmanned Copy Center was finally opened in Room 2E37 in March 1974 using a Xerox 4000, a plain-paper copier, and an SCM 412, a coated-paper copier. In addition to ISAS, seven other components agreed to assist us in evaluating the Center concept. These included the Offices of the Inspector General, Director of Central Reference, DDO/FR Support Staff, Director of Joint Computer Services, DDA Regulations Control Staff, OTR/OPS Training Program, and Headquarters Engineering Branch/OL. These two machines replaced a Xerox 2400 in OJCS, a Xerox 4000 in RCS and a Xerox 3100 in ISAS. Although D/CRS retained a purchased Xerox 813 and [] retained a Savin 220, the majority of their copying is now done in the Center. As a means of determining the number of copies made on the SCM 412 by each of the users, we installed an Auditizer, a device requiring the use of a "credit card" to activate the machine. The number of copies made by each user is recorded on a separate meter. This system began on 1 April 1974. Because of the high cost of installing this system on the Xerox 4000, we opted for the Auditron, a device which activates the machine by inserting a cartridge-type control into a receptacle. Unfortunately, we were not able to secure and install this device until 1 June 1974. With control devices on both copiers in the Center, the June volume decreased by 11,040 copies or 24 percent over previous months. The July volume increased slightly over June but was still less than earlier months. We are not naive enough to believe that this reflects a net reduction in copying by the users, but are convinced that control devices do reduce the number of copies made.

2. During Fiscal Year 1975 the type and model of the copiers in the Copy Center were changed as the requirements changed and to give RAB an opportunity to test different copiers. When the SALT Staff joined the Copy Center users, a sorter was needed. To satisfy this requirement, a Xerox Model 4500 was rented to replace the Model 4000. In addition to providing the needed sorter capability, this action gave RAB an opportunity to evaluate the Model 4500. The Model 4500 was not reliable nor cost effective. This, plus the increase in the volume copied in the Center, caused RAB to replace the Model 4500 with a Model 3600I. The SCM Model 412 was replaced by 3M Model VQC in October 1974 due to service problems.

3. As mentioned earlier, the test Center is unmanned. Since the equipment is operated by the customer, a variety of problems have been

identified. Machine breakdown, while not excessive, occurs frequently because of the number of operators each doing their own thing. Some supplies are being wasted, the proper machine isn't always used for the copying needed and the ability of the Xerox 4000 to do two-sided copy was frequently overlooked. In addition, the need for much of what is being copied is questionable. All of the operators have been trained in proper machine usage by the vendor and/or representatives of this Staff and periodic meetings are held to receive their comments and provide suggestions on improving the use of the Center. Another problem encountered is the reluctance of users to copy on the coated-paper copier. We believe this stems, not from the people actually operating the equipment but to a great extent from supervisors with a built-in reluctance to use coated-paper. Although the percentage of coated-paper copying has been increasing, emphasis from senior management throughout the Agency is essential to break with custom. This is a very real concern since coated-paper copy can be produced at one-half to one-third less than plain paper copy, depending upon the volume.

4. The success of this unmanned Copy Center is due to the fact that it is managed by RAB personnel. In any unmanned Center, someone has to be responsible for budgeting for the copiers, ordering supplies, keeping the room clean and orderly, and calling for the service technicians when the copiers malfunction. For this reason, unmanned Copy Centers would probably be more successful if all of the users were from the same office or division. The other alternative would be for the Office of Logistics to man and operate Copy Centers.

5. The concept of manned Copy Centers has been investigated with several possibilities available. One alternative would be to acquire a staff position for each Center and assign a full-time staff employee to operate the equipment. With current ceiling problems, this alternative seems remote. Another possibility would be to contract with a company to provide the services of a machine operator. This could be prohibitively expensive unless the Copy Center volume was very high. For instance, Dennison quotes a per-copy cost of \$.025 for 1-100,000 copies with a minimum charge of \$2,500 per month. Xerox charges are less specific since they prefer to tailor a program to the customers' needs and then quote a price. However, an estimate of \$3,000 to \$3,500 per month was quoted for a volume of 50,000 copies. Additionally, these firms are either reluctant to or refuse to use equipment in the Center other than their own which obviously limits the mixture of plain- and coated-paper copiers. Since the operators provided receive a small salary (approximately GS-04), turnover could be a problem with resulting additional expense to clear a replacement. A third possibility, and the one we think most reasonable, would be to hire part-time employees who would not count against ceiling to share the Center operation. This option

would provide personnel fully controlled by the Agency, operating equipment selected by the responsible Agency component. (This might be a way to use handicapped employees.)

6. The cost effectiveness of the Copy Center is difficult to evaluate because some of the users changed during the year, volumes increased dramatically these last six months as a result of FOIA and Investigation Task Force activity, and there was a several month delay in securing the new Auditron for the Xerox 3600. To simplify these calculations, we have assumed that during FY 75, each component copied the same percentage of the total fiscal year volume as copied in the month of June. Three tables have been prepared using these statistics and are attached.

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment A | <u>FY 75 Copy Center Volumes & Expenditures by Month and Copier.</u> |
| Attachment B | <u>Copy Center Cost Analysis for June 1975 by Component and Copier.</u>
The actual costs are pro-rated among using components and are compared to costs which would have been incurred had each component used its own Xerox copier which was best suited to the volume copied by that component. |
| Attachment C | <u>FY 75 Copy Center Analysis by Component.</u>
The actual FY 75 volumes are pro-rated among the users based upon their percentage of total June usage. Actual fiscal year usage by component is unknown since the Auditron was not in use for several months. |

Those components who used the Copy Center for a part of the fiscal year are included in Attachments B and C as "Other."

7. Both Attachments B and C show costs in the Copy Center to be less expensive than other arrangements. This is due primarily to the copier pricing structure. The minimum cost per copy on Xerox copiers averages about \$.04 and decreases as the volume increases. For example, the Model 3600-I starts at \$.0315 per copy and gradually decreases to \$.006 for all copies over 50,000. This can further be illustrated by the fact that two Model 4000's at 25,000 copies each per month will cost \$1,482, while the total 50,000 copies can be made on one Model 3600-I for \$1,101.

Attachments:
A, B, & C